Deriving a Simple Gradual Security Language

Ronald Garcia
Software Practices Lab
Department of Computer Science
University of British Columbia
rxg@cs.ubc.ca

Éric Tanter
PLEIAD Laboratory
Computer Science Department (DCC)
University of Chile
etanter@dcc.uchile.cl

arXiv:1511.01399v3 [cs.PL] 20 Nov 2015

Abstract

Abstracting Gradual Typing (AGT) is an approach to systematically deriving gradual counterparts to static type disciplines (Garcia et al. 2016). The approach consists of defining the semantics of gradual types by interpreting them as sets of static types, and then defining an optimal abstraction back to gradual types. These operations are used to lift the static discipline to the gradual setting. The runtime semantics of the gradual language then arises as reductions on gradual typing derivations.

To demonstrate the flexibility of AGT, we gradualize λ_{SEC} (Zdancewic 2002), the prototypical security-typed language, with respect to only security labels rather than entire types, yielding a type system that ranges gradually from simply-typed to securely-typed. We establish noninterference for the gradual language, called $\lambda_{\widetilde{\text{SEC}}}$, using Zdancewic's logical relation proof method. Whereas prior work presents gradual security *cast* languages, which require explicit security casts, this work yields the first gradual security *source* language, which requires no explicit casts.

1. Introduction

Gradual typing has often been viewed as a means to combine the agility benefits of *dynamic languages*, like Python and Ruby with the reliability benefits of *static languages* like OCaml and Scala. This paper, in a line of work on the foundations of gradual typing, explores the idea that static and dynamic are merely relative notions.

This relativistic view of gradual typing is not new. Work on gradual information flow security by Disney and Flanagan (2011) and Fennell and Thiemann (2013) develop languages where only information-flow security properties are subject to a mix of dynamic and static checking. Bañados Schwerter et al. (2014) develop a language where only computational effect capabilities are gradualized. In each of these cases, the "fully-dynamic" corner of the gradual language is not dynamic at all by typical standards, but rather simply typed. However, those languages support seamless migration toward a *more precise* typing discipline that subsumes simple typing.

To explore this notion, we revisit the idea of gradual information-flow security. Our tool of inquiry is a new approach to the foundations of gradual typing called Abstracting Gradual Typing (AGT) (Garcia et al. 2016). AGT is a technique for systematically deriving gradual type systems by interpreting gradual types as sets of static types. That work developed a traditional gradual type system with subtyping, introducing an *unknown type* ?. But AGT was directly inspired by Bañados Schwerter et al. (2014), who used an early version of these techniques to gradualize only effects. However, they develop the dynamic semantics of gradual effects in the traditional ad hoc fashion. Here, we bring the approach full circle, deriving a complete static and dynamic semantics for a gradual counterpart to the λ_{SEC} language of Zdancewic (2002).

In their simplest form, security-typed languages require values and types to be annotated with security labels, indicating their confidentiality level. The security type system guarantees *noninterference*, *i.e.*, that more-confidential information does not alter the less-confidential results of any expression.

We prove that the resulting gradual language, called $\lambda_{\widetilde{\text{SEC}}}$, is not only *safe* in that it never unexpectedly crashes, but that it is *sound* in that it honours the information-flow invariants of the precisely typed terms. The former property is unsurprising, since even the most imprecisely typed program still maintains the simple typing discipline, which is enough to establish the safety of the operational semantics. The soundness of the language with respect to the security type discipline, *i.e.*, that basic information flow properties are respected, is the key property.

The prior work in gradual security typing developed gradual *cast languages*, which require explicit type casts to connect imprecisely typed terms with precisely typed terms. This is akin to the intermediate languages of traditional gradually-typed languages. This work presents the first gradual *source* language, where no explicit casts are needed: they are introduced by the language semantics. Furthermore, following the AGT approach, the runtime semantics are induced by the proof of type safety for λ_{SEC}, yielding a crisp connection to that precise static type discipline.

As with the original work on AGT, we can straightforwardly establish proper adaptations of the refined criteria for gradually typed languages. We will do so in this ongoing work.

Ultimately this work views gradual typing as a theory of *imprecise typing* rather than dynamic checking. Indeed dynamic checking is an inevitable consequence of this approach, but the focus here is on the types and their meaning. We believe that this broader view of gradual typing can widen the reach of gradual typing beyond its current niche of interest among dynamic language enthusiasts. Furthermore, we believe that AGT generalizes the foundations of gradual typing enough to support a wide variety of gradual type disciplines.

2. The Static Language: λ_{SEC}

We first present the λ_{SEC} language, with some differences from the original presentation (Zdancewic 2002). The most notable changes are that the type system is syntax directed, and the runtime semantics are small-step structural operational semantics rather than big-step natural semantics.

Figure 1 presents the syntax and type system for λ_{SEC}. The language extends a simple typing discipline with a lattice of *security labels* ℓ. All program values are ascribed security labels, which are partial ordered $\preccurlyeq$ from low security to high-security and include top and bottom security labels $\top$ and $\bot$. The λ_{SEC} types S extend

$\ell \in \textsc{Label}, \quad S \in \textsc{Type}, \quad x \in \textsc{Var}, \quad b \in \textsc{Bool}, \quad \oplus \in \textsc{BoolOp}$
$t \in \textsc{Term}, \quad r \in \textsc{RawValue} \quad v \in \textsc{Value} \quad \Gamma \in \textsc{Var} \xrightarrow{\text{fin}} \textsc{Type}$

S	::=	$\mathsf{Bool}_\ell \mid S \to_\ell S$	(types)
b	::=	$\mathsf{true} \mid \mathsf{false}$	(Booleans)
r	::=	$b \mid \lambda x : S.t$	(raw values)
v	::=	r_ℓ	(values)
t	::=	$v \mid t\ t \mid t \oplus t \mid \mathsf{if}\ t\ \mathsf{then}\ t\ \mathsf{else}\ t \mid t :: S$	(terms)
$\oplus$	::=	$\wedge \mid \vee \mid \Longrightarrow$	(operations)

$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash t : S}$

$$(\text{Sx})\frac{x : S \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : S} \qquad (\text{Sb})\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash b_\ell : \mathsf{Bool}_\ell}$$

$$(\text{S}\lambda)\frac{\Gamma, x : S_1 \vdash t : S_2}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : S_1.t)_\ell : S_1 \to_\ell S_2}$$

$$(\text{S}\oplus)\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : \mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_1} \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : \mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_2}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 \oplus t_2 : \mathsf{Bool}_{(\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2)}}$$

$$(\text{Sapp})\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : S_{11} \to_\ell S_{12} \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : S_2 \quad S_2 <: S_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1\ t_2 : S_{12} \curlyvee \ell}$$

$$(\text{Sif})\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \mathsf{Bool}_\ell \quad \Gamma \vdash t_1 : S_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : S_2}{\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{if}\ t\ \mathsf{then}\ t_1\ \mathsf{else}\ t_2 : (S_1 \mathbin{\ddot{\vee}} S_2) \curlyvee \ell}$$

$$(\text{S::})\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : S_1 \quad S_1 <: S_2}{\Gamma \vdash t :: S_2 : S_2}$$

$\boxed{S <: S}$

$$\frac{\ell \preccurlyeq \ell'}{\mathsf{Bool}_\ell <: \mathsf{Bool}_{\ell'}} \qquad \frac{S_1' <: S_1 \quad S_2 <: S_2' \quad \ell \preccurlyeq \ell'}{S_1 \to_\ell S_2 <: S_1' \to_{\ell'} S_2'}$$

$\boxed{S \mathbin{\ddot{\vee}} S,\ S \mathbin{\ddot{\wedge}} S}$

$\mathbin{\ddot{\vee}} : \textsc{Type} \times \textsc{Type} \rightharpoonup \textsc{Type}$
$\mathsf{Bool}_\ell \mathbin{\ddot{\vee}} \mathsf{Bool}_{\ell'} = \mathsf{Bool}_{(\ell \curlyvee \ell')}$
$(S_{11} \to_\ell S_{12}) \mathbin{\ddot{\vee}} (S_{21} \to_{\ell'} S_{22}) = (S_{11} \mathbin{\ddot{\wedge}} S_{21}) \to_{(\ell \curlyvee \ell')} (S_{12} \mathbin{\ddot{\vee}} S_{22})$
$S \mathbin{\ddot{\vee}} S$ undefined otherwise

$\mathbin{\ddot{\wedge}} : \textsc{Type} \times \textsc{Type} \rightharpoonup \textsc{Type}$
$\mathsf{Bool}_\ell \mathbin{\ddot{\wedge}} \mathsf{Bool}_{\ell'} = \mathsf{Bool}_{(\ell \curlyvee \ell')}$
$(S_{11} \to_\ell S_{12}) \mathbin{\ddot{\wedge}} (S_{21} \to_{\ell'} S_{22}) = (S_{11} \mathbin{\ddot{\vee}} S_{21}) \to_{(\ell \curlyvee \ell')} (S_{12} \mathbin{\ddot{\wedge}} S_{22})$
$S \mathbin{\ddot{\wedge}} S$ undefined otherwise

Figure 1. λ_{SEC}: Syntax and Static Semantics

a simple type discipline by associating a security label to each type constructor.

Rules for variables, constants and functions are straightforward. The (S$\oplus$) rule for binary boolean operations ensures that the confidentiality of combining two values is the least upper bound, or *join* $\curlyvee$, of the confidentiality of the two sub-expressions. Similarly, when applying a function (Sapp), the result type joins the label of the function's result type S_{12} with the label ℓ of the function type. For this, the rule uses a notion of *label stamping* on types:[1]

$$\mathsf{Bool}_\ell \curlyvee \ell' = \mathsf{Bool}_{(\ell \curlyvee \ell')}$$
$$(S_1 \to_\ell S_2) \curlyvee \ell' = S_1 \to_{(\ell \curlyvee \ell')} S_2$$

Rule (Sapp) also appeals to a notion of subtyping $S <: S$. Subtyping is induced by the ordering on security labels. It allows lower-security values to flow to higher-security contexts, but not vice-versa. Rule (Sif) specifies that the type of a conditional is the *subtyping join* $\mathbin{\ddot{\vee}}$ of the types of the branches, further stamped to incorporate the confidentiality of the predicate expression's label l. The latter is necessary to forbid indirect flow of information through the conditional. As usual, the join of two function types is defined in terms of the *meet* $\mathbin{\ddot{\wedge}}$ of the argument types, which in turn relies on the *label meet* operator $\curlyvee$. The (S::) rule introduces ascription, which can move the type of an expression to any supertype.

These syntax-directed typing rules define a type system that is sound and complete with respect to Zdancewic's. The following propositions use $\vdash^Z$ for the type system of Zdancewic (2002), and consider only terms without ascription (*i.e.*, the common subset of the two systems).

[1] We overload the join notation $\curlyvee$ throughout, and rely on the context to disambiguate.

t	::=	$\ldots \mid t \curlyvee \ell$	(term stamping)
f	::=	$\Box \oplus t \mid v \oplus \Box \mid \Box\ t \mid v\ \Box$	(frames)
		$\mathsf{if}\ \Box\ \mathsf{then}\ t\ \mathsf{else}\ t \mid \Box \curlyvee \ell$	

$$(\text{S}\curlyvee)\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : S}{\Gamma \vdash t \curlyvee \ell : S \curlyvee \ell}$$

$\boxed{t \longrightarrow t}$ **Notions of Reduction**

$$b_{1\,\ell_1} \oplus b_{2\,\ell_2} \longrightarrow (b_1 \mathbin{[\![\oplus]\!]} b_2)_{(\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2)}$$
$$(\lambda x : S.t)_\ell\ v \longrightarrow ([v/x]t) \curlyvee \ell$$
$$\mathsf{if}\ \mathsf{true}_\ell\ \mathsf{then}\ t_1\ \mathsf{else}\ t_2 \longrightarrow t_1 \curlyvee \ell$$
$$\mathsf{if}\ \mathsf{false}_\ell\ \mathsf{then}\ t_1\ \mathsf{else}\ t_2 \longrightarrow t_2 \curlyvee \ell$$
$$r_{\ell_1} \curlyvee \ell_2 \longrightarrow r_{(\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2)}$$

$\boxed{t \longmapsto t}$ **Reduction**

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t_2}{t_1 \longmapsto t_2} \qquad \frac{t_1 \longmapsto t_2}{f[t_1] \longmapsto f[t_2]}$$

Figure 2. λ_{SEC}: Small-Step Dynamic Semantics

Proposition 1. *If* $\Gamma \vdash t : S$ *then* $\Gamma \vdash^Z t : S$.

Proof. By induction on $\Gamma \vdash t : S$. □

Proposition 2. *If* $\Gamma \vdash^Z t : S$ *Then* $\Gamma \vdash t : S'$ *for some* $S' <: S$.

Proof. By induction on $\Gamma \vdash^Z t : S$. □

Dynamic semantics. The dynamic semantics of λ_{SEC} were originally presented as big step semantics (Zdancewic 2002). Figure 2 presents the equivalent small-step semantics. Of particular interest is the new label stamping form on terms, which we call *term stamping* $t \curlyvee \ell$. Term stamping allows small-step reduction to retain security information that is merged with the resulting value of the nested term.

This small-step semantics coincides with the big-step semantics of λ_{SEC} (Zdancewic 2002). Note that we establish the equivalence to the source λ_{SEC} language (Figure 1), *i.e.*, without term stamping, since it is only needed internally to support small-step reduction. As usual, $\longmapsto^*$ denotes the reflexive, transitive closure of $\longmapsto$.

Proposition 3. $t \Downarrow v$ *if and only if* $t \longmapsto^* v$.

Proof.

Case (only if). By induction on $t \Downarrow v$, using the admissibility of the $\Downarrow$ rules in $\longmapsto^*$.

Case (if). By induction on the length of the reduction $t \longmapsto^* v$. Straightforward case analysis on t using the admissibility of the inversion lemmas for $\Downarrow$ in $\longmapsto^*$.

□

3. Gradualizing λ_{SEC}

In gradualizing λ_{SEC}, we could decide to support unknown information in both types and security labels. Here, to show the flexibility of the AGT approach, we gradualize λ_{SEC} only in terms of security labels, thereby supporting a gradual evolution between simply-typed programs and securely-typed programs.

3.1 Meaning of Unknown Security Type Information

To gradualize our security types, we introduce a notion of *gradual labels* and define their meanings in terms of concrete labels of a given security lattice.

Definition 1 (Gradual labels)**.** *A gradual label $\tilde{\ell}$ is either a label ℓ or the unknown label* ?.

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \tilde{\ell} & \in & \text{GLABEL} & \\ \tilde{\ell} & ::= & \ell \mid ? & \text{(gradual labels)} \end{array}$$

As with static security typing, we develop gradual security types by assigning a gradual label to every type constructor.

Definition 2 (Gradual security type)**.** *A gradual security type is a gradual type labeled with a gradual label:*

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \widetilde{S} & \in & \text{GTYPE} & \\ \widetilde{S} & ::= & \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}} \mid \widetilde{S} \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S} & \text{(gradual types)} \end{array}$$

To give meaning to gradual security types, we use the AGT approach of defining a concretization function that maps gradual security types to sets of static security types. This concretization is the natural lifting of a concretization for gradual labels.

Definition 3 (Label Concretization)**.** *Let $\gamma_\ell : \text{GLABEL} \to \mathcal{P}(\text{LABEL})$ be defined as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\ell(\ell) &= \{\, \ell \,\} \\ \gamma_\ell(?) &= \text{LABEL} \end{aligned}$$

We give meaning to the unknown label by saying that it represents *any label*. On the other hand, any static label represents only itself.

Since we are operating on complete lattices, the sound and optimal abstraction function from sets of labels to gradual labels is fully determined by the concretization. We characterize it below.

Definition 4 (Label Abstraction)**.** *Let $\alpha_\ell : \mathcal{P}(\text{LABEL}) \to \text{GLABEL}$ be defined as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_\ell(\{\, \ell \,\}) &= \ell \\ \alpha_\ell(\emptyset) &\text{ is undefined} \\ \alpha_\ell(\widehat{\ell}) &= ? \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4 (α_ℓ is Sound)**.** *If $\widehat{\ell}$ is not empty, then $\widehat{\ell} \subseteq \gamma_\ell(\alpha_\ell(\widehat{\ell}))$.*

Proof. By case analysis on the structure of $\widehat{\ell}$. If $\widehat{\ell} = \{\, \ell \,\}$ then $\gamma_\ell(\alpha_\ell(\{\, \ell \,\})) = \gamma_\ell(\ell) = \{\, \ell \,\} = \widehat{\ell}$, otherwise
$\gamma_\ell(\alpha_\ell(\widehat{\ell})) = \gamma_\ell(?) = \text{LABEL} \supseteq \widehat{\ell}$.

□

Proposition 5 (α_ℓ is Optimal)**.** *If $\widehat{\ell} \subseteq \gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell})$ then $\alpha_\ell(\widehat{\ell}) \sqsubseteq \tilde{\ell}$.*

Proof. By case analysis on the structure of $\tilde{\ell}$. If $\tilde{\ell} = \ell$, $\gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell}) = \{\, \ell \,\}$; $\widehat{\ell} \subseteq \{\, \ell \,\}, \widehat{\ell} \neq \emptyset$ implies $\alpha_\ell(\widehat{\ell}) = \alpha_\ell(\{\, \ell \,\}) = \ell \sqsubseteq \tilde{\ell}$ (if $\widehat{\ell} = \emptyset$, $\alpha_\ell(\widehat{\ell})$ is undefined). If $\tilde{\ell} = ?$, $\tilde{\ell}' \sqsubseteq \tilde{\ell}$ for all $\tilde{\ell}'$. □

Having defined the meaning of gradual labels, we define the meaning of gradual security types via concretization.

Definition 5 (Type Concretization)**.** *Let $\gamma_S : \text{GTYPE} \to \mathcal{P}(\text{TYPE})$ be defined as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_S(\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}) &= \{\, \mathsf{Bool}_\ell \mid \ell \in \gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell}) \,\} \\ \gamma_S(\widetilde{S} \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}) &= \gamma_S(\widetilde{S_1}) \mathbin{\widehat{\to}}_{\gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell})} \gamma_S(\widetilde{S_2}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widehat{S_1} \mathbin{\widehat{\to}}_{\widehat{\ell}} \widehat{S_2} = \{\, S_1 \to_\ell S_2 \mid S_i \in \gamma_S(\widehat{S_i}), \ell \in \widehat{\ell} \,\}.$$

With concretization of security type, we can now define security type precision.

Definition 6 (Label and Type Precision)**.**

1. *$\tilde{\ell}_1$ is less imprecise than $\tilde{\ell}_2$, notation $\tilde{\ell}_1 \sqsubseteq \tilde{\ell}_2$, if and only if $\gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell}_1) \subseteq \gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell}_2)$; inductively:*

$$\frac{}{\tilde{\ell} \sqsubseteq ?} \qquad \frac{}{\tilde{\ell} \sqsubseteq \tilde{\ell}}$$

2. *$\widetilde{S}_1$ is less imprecise than $\widetilde{S}_2$, notation $\widetilde{S}_1 \sqsubseteq \widetilde{S}_2$, if and only if $\gamma_S(\widetilde{S}_1) \subseteq \gamma_S(\widetilde{S}_2)$; inductively:*

$$\frac{\tilde{\ell}_1 \sqsubseteq \tilde{\ell}_2}{\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_2}} \qquad \frac{\widetilde{S}_{11} \sqsubseteq \widetilde{S}_{21} \quad \widetilde{S}_{12} \sqsubseteq \widetilde{S}_{22} \quad \tilde{\ell}_1 \sqsubseteq \tilde{\ell}_2}{\widetilde{S}_{11} \to_{\tilde{\ell}_1} \widetilde{S}_{12} \sqsubseteq \widetilde{S}_{21} \to_{\tilde{\ell}_2} \widetilde{S}_{22}}$$

We now define the abstraction function.

Definition 7 (Type Abstraction)**.** *Let the abstraction function $\alpha_S : \mathcal{P}(\text{TYPE}) \to \text{GTYPE}$ be defined as:*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_S(\{\, \overline{\mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_i}} \,\}) &= \mathsf{Bool}_{\alpha_\ell(\{\, \overline{\ell_i} \,\})} \\ \alpha_S(\{\, \overline{S_{i1} \to_{\ell_i} S_{i2}} \,\}) &= \alpha_S(\{\, \overline{S_{i1}} \,\}) \to_{\alpha_\ell(\{\, \overline{\ell_i} \,\})} \alpha_S(\{\, \overline{S_{i2}} \,\}) \\ \alpha_S(\widehat{T}) &\text{ is undefined otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

We can only abstract *valid* sets of security types, *i.e.* in which elements only defer by security labels.

Definition 8 (Valid Type Sets)**.**

$$\frac{}{valid(\{\, \overline{\mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_i}} \,\})} \qquad \frac{valid(\{\, \overline{S_{i1}} \,\}) \qquad valid(\{\, \overline{S_{i2}} \,\})}{valid(\{\, \overline{(S_{i1} \to S_{i2})_{\ell_i}} \,\})}$$

Proposition 6 (α_S is Sound)**.**
If $valid(\widehat{S})$ then $\widehat{S} \subseteq \gamma_S(\alpha_S(\widehat{S}))$.

Proof. By well-founded induction on $\widehat{S}$ according to the ordering relation $\widehat{S} \sqsubset \widehat{S}$ defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{dom}(\widehat{S}) &\sqsubset \widehat{S} \\ \widehat{cod}(\widehat{S}) &\sqsubset \widehat{S} \end{aligned}$$

Where $\widehat{dom}, \widehat{cod} : \mathcal{P}(\text{GTYPE}) \to \mathcal{P}(GType)$ are the collecting liftings of the domain and codomain functions dom, cod respectively, *e.g.*,

$$\widehat{dom}(\widehat{S}) = \{\, dom(S) \mid S \in \widehat{S} \,\}.$$

We then consider cases on $\widehat{S}$ according to the definition of α_S.

Case ($\{\,\overline{\mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_i}}\,\}$).

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_S(\alpha_S(\{\,\overline{\mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_i}}\,\})) &= \gamma_S(\mathsf{Bool}_{\alpha_\ell(\{\,\overline{\ell_i}\,\})}) \\ &= \{\,\mathsf{Bool}_\ell \mid \ell \in \gamma_\ell(\alpha_\ell(\{\,\overline{\ell_i}\,\}))\,\} \\ &\supseteq \{\,\overline{\mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_i}}\,\} \text{ by soundness of } \alpha_\ell.\end{aligned}$$

Case ($\{\,\overline{S_{i1} \to_{\ell_i} S_{i2}}\,\}$).

$$\begin{aligned}&\gamma_S(\alpha_S(\{\,\overline{S_{i1} \to_{\ell_i} S_{i2}}\,\})) \\ &= \gamma_S(\alpha_S(\{\,\overline{S_{i1}}\,\}) \to_{\alpha_\ell(\{\,\overline{\ell_i}\,\})} \alpha_S(\{\,\overline{S_{i2}}\,\})) \\ &= \gamma_S(\alpha_S(\{\,\overline{S_{i1}}\,\}) \to_{\gamma_\ell(\alpha_\ell(\{\,\overline{\ell_i}\,\}))} \gamma_S(\alpha_S(\{\,\overline{S_{i2}}\,\})) \\ &\supseteq \{\,\overline{S_{i1} \to_{\ell_i} S_{i2}}\,\}\end{aligned}$$

by induction hypotheses on $\{\,\overline{S_{i1}}\,\}$ and $\{\,\overline{S_{i2}}\,\}$, and soundness of α_ℓ.

□

Proposition 7 (α_S is Optimal)**.** *If $valid(\widehat{S})$ and $\widehat{S} \subseteq \gamma_S(\widetilde{S})$ then $\alpha_S(\widehat{S}) \sqsubseteq \widetilde{S}$.*

Proof. By induction on the structure of $\widetilde{S}$.

Case ($\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}$). $\gamma_S(\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}) = \{\,\mathsf{Bool}_\ell \mid \ell \in \gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell})\,\}$
So $\widehat{S} = \{\,\mathsf{Bool}_\ell \mid \ell \in \widehat{\ell}\,\}$ for some $\widehat{\ell} \subseteq \gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell})$. By optimality of α_ℓ, $\alpha_\ell(\widehat{\ell}) \sqsubseteq \tilde{\ell}$, so $\alpha_S(\{\,\mathsf{Bool}_\ell \mid \ell \in \widehat{\ell}\,\}) = \mathsf{Bool}_{\alpha_\ell(\widehat{\ell})} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}$.

Case ($\widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2$). $\gamma_S(\widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2) = \gamma_S(\widetilde{S}_1) \to_{\gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell})} \gamma_S(\widetilde{S}_2)$.
So $\widehat{S} = \{\,\overline{S_{1i} \to_{l_i} S_{2i}}\,\}$, with $\{\,\overline{S_{1i}}\,\} \subseteq \gamma_S(\widetilde{S}_1)$, $\{\,\overline{S_{1i}}\,\} \subseteq \gamma_S(\widetilde{S}_2)$, and $\{\,\overline{l_i}\,\} \subseteq \gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell})$. By induction hypotheses, $\alpha_S(\{\,\overline{S_{1i}}\,\}) \sqsubseteq \widetilde{S}_1$ and $\alpha_S(\{\,\overline{S_{2i}}\,\}) \sqsubseteq \widetilde{S}_2$, and by optimality of α_ℓ, $\alpha_\ell(\{\,\overline{l_i}\,\}) \sqsubseteq \tilde{\ell}$. Hence $\alpha_S(\{\,\overline{S_{1i} \to_{l_i} S_{2i}}\,\}) = \alpha_S(\{\,\overline{S_{1i}}\,\}) \to_{\alpha_\ell(\{\,\overline{l_i}\,\})} \alpha_S(\{\,\overline{S_{2i}}\,\}) \sqsubseteq \widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2$.

□

3.2 Consistent Predicates and Operators

Following the AGT approach, we lift predicates on labels and types to *consistent* predicates on the corresponding gradual labels and gradual types. Consistent predicates hold if *some* member of the collecting semantics satisfies the corresponding static predicate. We lift partial functions to gradual partial functions, as per the standard approach in abstract interpretation.

Definition 9 (Consistent label ordering)**.** *$\tilde{\ell}_1 \mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}} \tilde{\ell}_2$ if and only if $\ell_1 \preccurlyeq \ell_2$ for some $(\ell_1, \ell_2) \in \gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell}_1) \times \gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell}_2)$.*
Algorithmically:

$$\frac{}{? \mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}} \tilde{\ell}} \qquad \frac{}{\tilde{\ell} \mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}} ?} \qquad \frac{\ell_1 \preccurlyeq \ell_2}{\ell_1 \mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}} \ell_2}$$

Definition 10 (Gradual label join)**.**
$\tilde{\ell}_1 \mathbin{\widetilde{\curlyvee}} \tilde{\ell}_2 = \alpha_\ell(\{\,\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2 \mid (\ell_1, \ell_2) \in \gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell}_1) \times \gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell}_2)\,\})$.
Algorithmically:

$$\begin{aligned}\top \mathbin{\widetilde{\curlyvee}} ? = ? \mathbin{\widetilde{\curlyvee}} \top &= \top \\ \tilde{\ell} \mathbin{\widetilde{\curlyvee}} ? = ? \mathbin{\widetilde{\curlyvee}} \tilde{\ell} &= ? \text{ if } \tilde{\ell} \neq \top \\ \ell_1 \mathbin{\widetilde{\curlyvee}} \ell_2 &= \ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2\end{aligned}$$

Both gradual label stamping and gradual join of security types are obtained by lifting their corresponding static operations:

Definition 11 (Gradual label meet)**.**
$\tilde{\ell}_1 \mathbin{\widetilde{\curlywedge}} \tilde{\ell}_2 = \alpha_\ell(\{\,\ell_1 \curlywedge \ell_2 \mid (\ell_1, \ell_2) \in \gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell}_1) \times \gamma_\ell(\tilde{\ell}_2)\,\})$.

Algorithmically:

$$\begin{aligned}\bot \mathbin{\widetilde{\curlywedge}} ? = ? \mathbin{\widetilde{\curlywedge}} \bot &= \bot \\ \tilde{\ell} \mathbin{\widetilde{\curlywedge}} ? = ? \mathbin{\widetilde{\curlywedge}} \tilde{\ell} &= ? \text{ if } \tilde{\ell} \neq \bot \\ \ell_1 \mathbin{\widetilde{\curlywedge}} \ell_2 &= \ell_1 \curlywedge \ell_2\end{aligned}$$

We now lift subtyping to gradual security types.

Definition 12 (Consistent subtyping)**.** *$\widetilde{S}_1 \lesssim \widetilde{S}_2$ if and only if $S_1 <: S_2$ for some $(S_1, S_2) \in \gamma_S(\widetilde{S}_1) \times \gamma_S(\widetilde{S}_2)$*

3.3 Gradual Security Type System

The gradual security type system is adapted from Figure 1 by lifting static types and labels to gradual types and labels, lifting partial functions on static types to partial functions on gradual types, and lifting predicates on types and labels to consistent predicates on gradual types and labels.

The AGT approach yields a gradual counterpart to an underlying static type system that satisfies a number of desirable properties. To state these properties, the following propositions use $\vdash_S$ to denote the λ_{SEC} typing relation of Figure 1.

Proposition 8 (Conservative Extension)**.** *For $t \in$ TERM, $\vdash_S t : S$ if and only if $\vdash t : S$*

Proof. By induction over the typing derivations. The proof is trivial because static types are given singleton meanings via concretization. □

In the following proposition, precision on terms $\widetilde{t}_1 \sqsubseteq \widetilde{t}_2$ is the natural lifting of type precision to terms.

Proposition 9 (Static gradual guarantee)**.** *If $\vdash \widetilde{t}_1 : \widetilde{S}_1$ and $\widetilde{t}_1 \sqsubseteq \widetilde{t}_2$, then $\vdash \widetilde{t}_2 : \widetilde{S}_2$ and $\widetilde{S}_1 \sqsubseteq \widetilde{S}_2$.*

Proof. Corollary of the corresponding proposition for open terms. By induction on typing derivation of $\Gamma \vdash \widetilde{t}_1 : \widetilde{S}_1$ using the definition of $\widetilde{t}_1 \sqsubseteq \widetilde{t}_2$. □

3.4 Dynamic Semantics of Gradual Security Typing

Interiors of consistent subtyping and label ordering. The *interior* of a consistent judgment expresses the most precise deducible information about a consistent judgment. We define the interior of a judgment in terms of our abstraction.

Definition 13 (Interior)**.** *Let P be a binary predicate on static types. Then the* interior *of the judgment $P(\widetilde{T}_1, \widetilde{T}_2)$, notation $\mathcal{I}_P(\widetilde{T}_1, \widetilde{T}_2)$, is the smallest tuple $\langle \widetilde{T}_1', \widetilde{T}_2' \rangle \sqsubseteq^2 \langle \widetilde{T}_1, \widetilde{T}_2 \rangle$ such that for $\langle T_1, T_2 \rangle \in$ TYPE^2, if $\langle T_1, T_2 \rangle \in \gamma^2(\widetilde{T}_1, \widetilde{T}_2)$ and $P(T_1, T_2)$, then $\langle T_1, T_2 \rangle \in \gamma^2(\widetilde{T}_1', \widetilde{T}_2')$.*
It is formalized as follows:

$$\mathcal{I}_P(\widetilde{T}_1, \widetilde{T}_2) = \alpha^2(\{\,\langle T_1, T_2 \rangle \in \gamma^2(\widetilde{T}_1, \widetilde{T}_2) \mid P(T_1, T_2)\,\}).$$

We use case-based analysis to calculate the algorithmic rules for the interior of consistent subtyping on gradual security types:

$$\frac{\mathcal{I}_{\precsim}(\tilde{\ell}_1, \tilde{\ell}_2) = \langle \tilde{\ell}_1', \tilde{\ell}_2' \rangle}{\mathcal{I}_{<:}(\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1}, \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_2}) = \langle \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1'}, \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_2'} \rangle}$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{I}_{<:}(\widetilde{S}_{21}, \widetilde{S}_{11}) = \langle \widetilde{S}_{21}', \widetilde{S}_{11}' \rangle \quad \mathcal{I}_{<:}(\widetilde{S}_{12}, \widetilde{S}_{22}) = \langle \widetilde{S}_{12}', \widetilde{S}_{22}' \rangle \quad \mathcal{I}_{\precsim}(\tilde{\ell}_1, \tilde{\ell}_2) = \langle \tilde{\ell}_1', \tilde{\ell}_2' \rangle}{\mathcal{I}_{<:}(\widetilde{S}_{11} \to_{\tilde{\ell}_1} \widetilde{S}_{12}, \widetilde{S}_{21} \to_{\tilde{\ell}_2} \widetilde{S}_{22}) = \langle \widetilde{S}_{11}' \to_{\tilde{\ell}_1'} \widetilde{S}_{12}', \widetilde{S}_{21}' \to_{\tilde{\ell}_2'} \widetilde{S}_{22}' \rangle}$$

$\tilde{\ell} \in \text{GLABEL}, \quad \widetilde{S} \in \text{GTYPE}, \quad x \in \text{VAR}, \quad b \in \text{BOOL}, \quad \oplus \in \text{BOOLOP}$
$\widetilde{t} \in \text{GTERM}, \quad r \in \text{RAWVALUE} \quad v \in \text{VALUE} \quad \Gamma \in \text{VAR} \xrightarrow{\text{fin}} \text{GTYPE}$

$$\begin{array}{lcll} \widetilde{S} & ::= & \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}} \mid \widetilde{S} \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S} & \text{(gradual types)} \\ b & ::= & \mathsf{true} \mid \mathsf{false} & \text{(Booleans)} \\ r & ::= & b \mid \lambda x : \widetilde{S}.\widetilde{t} & \text{(base values)} \\ v & ::= & r_{\ell} & \text{(values)} \\ \widetilde{t} & ::= & v \mid \widetilde{t}\,\widetilde{t} \mid \widetilde{t} \oplus \widetilde{t} \mid \mathsf{if}\ \widetilde{t}\ \mathsf{then}\ \widetilde{t}\ \mathsf{else}\ \widetilde{t} & \text{(terms)} \\ \oplus & ::= & \wedge \mid \vee \mid \Longrightarrow & \text{(operations)} \end{array}$$

$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash t : S}$

$$(\widetilde{S}\text{x})\frac{x : \widetilde{S} \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : \widetilde{S}} \qquad (\widetilde{S}\text{b})\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash b_{\tilde{\ell}} : \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}}$$

$$(\widetilde{S}\lambda)\frac{\Gamma, x : \widetilde{S}_1 \vdash \widetilde{t} : \widetilde{S}_2}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : \widetilde{S}_1.\widetilde{t})_{\tilde{\ell}} : \widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2}$$

$$(\widetilde{S}\oplus)\frac{\Gamma \vdash \widetilde{t}_1 : \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1} \qquad \Gamma \vdash \widetilde{t}_2 : \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_2}}{\Gamma \vdash \widetilde{t}_1 \oplus \widetilde{t}_2 : \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1 \widetilde{\Upsilon} \tilde{\ell}_2}}$$

$$(\widetilde{S}\text{app})\frac{\Gamma \vdash \widetilde{t}_1 : \widetilde{S}_{11} \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash \widetilde{t}_2 : \widetilde{S}_2 \qquad \widetilde{S}_2 \lesssim \widetilde{S}_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash \widetilde{t}_1\ \widetilde{t}_2 : \widetilde{S}_{12}\ \widetilde{\Upsilon}\ \tilde{\ell}}$$

$$(\widetilde{S}\text{if})\frac{\Gamma \vdash \widetilde{t} : \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}} \qquad \Gamma \vdash \widetilde{t}_1 : \widetilde{S}_1 \qquad \Gamma \vdash \widetilde{t}_2 : \widetilde{S}_2}{\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{if}\ \widetilde{t}\ \mathsf{then}\ \widetilde{t}_1\ \mathsf{else}\ \widetilde{t}_2 : (\widetilde{S}_1 \widetilde{\dot{\vee}} \widetilde{S}_2)\ \widetilde{\Upsilon}\ \tilde{\ell}}$$

$$(\widetilde{S}::)\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \widetilde{S}_1 \qquad \widetilde{S}_1 \lesssim \widetilde{S}_2}{\Gamma \vdash t :: \widetilde{S}_2 : \widetilde{S}_2}$$

$\boxed{\widetilde{S} \lesssim \widetilde{S}}$

$$\frac{\tilde{\ell}\ \widetilde{\preccurlyeq}\ \tilde{\ell}'}{\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}} \lesssim \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}'}} \qquad \frac{\widetilde{S}'_1 \lesssim \widetilde{S}_1 \qquad \widetilde{S}_2 \lesssim \widetilde{S}'_2 \qquad \tilde{\ell}\ \widetilde{\preccurlyeq}\ \tilde{\ell}'}{\widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2 \lesssim \widetilde{S}'_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}'} \widetilde{S}'_2}$$

$\boxed{S \widetilde{\dot{\vee}} S,\ S \widetilde{\dot{\wedge}} S}$

$\widetilde{\dot{\vee}} : \text{GTYPE} \times \text{GTYPE} \rightharpoonup \text{GTYPE}$
$\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{\dot{\vee}} \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}'} = \mathsf{Bool}_{(\tilde{\ell} \widetilde{\Upsilon} \tilde{\ell}')}$
$(\widetilde{S}_{11} \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_{12}) \widetilde{\dot{\vee}} (\widetilde{S}_{21} \to_{\tilde{\ell}'} \widetilde{S}_{22}) = (\widetilde{S}_{11} \widetilde{\dot{\wedge}} \widetilde{S}_{21}) \to_{(\tilde{\ell} \widetilde{\Upsilon} \tilde{\ell}')} (\widetilde{S}_{12} \widetilde{\dot{\vee}} \widetilde{S}_{22})$
$\widetilde{S} \widetilde{\dot{\vee}} \widetilde{S}$ undefined otherwise

$\widetilde{\dot{\wedge}} : \text{GTYPE} \times \text{GTYPE} \rightharpoonup \text{GTYPE}$
$\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{\dot{\wedge}} \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}'} = \mathsf{Bool}_{(\tilde{\ell} \widetilde{\curlywedge} \tilde{\ell}')}$
$(\widetilde{S}_{11} \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_{12}) \widetilde{\dot{\wedge}} (\widetilde{S}_{21} \to_{\tilde{\ell}'} \widetilde{S}_{22}) = (\widetilde{S}_{11} \widetilde{\dot{\vee}} \widetilde{S}_{21}) \to_{(\tilde{\ell} \widetilde{\curlywedge} \tilde{\ell}')} (\widetilde{S}_{12} \widetilde{\dot{\wedge}} \widetilde{S}_{22})$
$\widetilde{S} \widetilde{\dot{\wedge}} \widetilde{S}$ undefined otherwise

Figure 3. $\lambda_{\widetilde{\text{SEC}}}$: Syntax and Static Semantics

The rules appeal to the algorithmic rules for the interior of consistent label ordering, calculated similarly:

$$\frac{\ell \neq \top}{\mathcal{I}_{\preccurlyeq}(\ell, ?) = \langle \ell, ? \rangle} \qquad \frac{}{\mathcal{I}_{\preccurlyeq}(\top, ?) = \langle \top, \top \rangle}$$

$$\frac{\ell \neq \bot}{\mathcal{I}_{\preccurlyeq}(?, \ell) = \langle ?, \ell \rangle} \qquad \frac{}{\mathcal{I}_{\preccurlyeq}(?, \bot) = \langle \bot, \bot \rangle}$$

$$\frac{}{\mathcal{I}_{\preccurlyeq}(\tilde{\ell}, \tilde{\ell}) = \langle \tilde{\ell}, \tilde{\ell} \rangle}$$

$$\frac{}{x^{\widetilde{S}} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}} \qquad \frac{}{b_{\tilde{\ell}} \in \text{TERM}_{\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}}}$$

$$\frac{t^{\widetilde{S}_2} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_2}}{(\lambda x^{\widetilde{S}_1}.t^{\widetilde{S}_2})_{\tilde{\ell}} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2}}$$

$$\frac{t^{\widetilde{S}_1} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_1} \qquad \varepsilon_1 \vdash \widetilde{S}_1 \lesssim \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1} \qquad t^{\widetilde{S}_2} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_2} \qquad \varepsilon_2 \vdash \widetilde{S}_2 \lesssim \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_2}}{\varepsilon_1 t^{\widetilde{S}_1} \oplus^{\tilde{\ell}_1 \widetilde{\Upsilon} \tilde{\ell}_2} \varepsilon_2 t^{\widetilde{S}_2} \in \text{TERM}_{\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1 \widetilde{\Upsilon} \tilde{\ell}_2}}}$$

$$\frac{t^{\widetilde{S}_1} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_1} \qquad \varepsilon_1 \vdash \widetilde{S}_1 \lesssim \widetilde{S}_{11} \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_{12} \qquad t^{\widetilde{S}_2} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_2} \qquad \varepsilon_2 \vdash \widetilde{S}_2 \lesssim \widetilde{S}_{11}}{\varepsilon_1 t^{\widetilde{S}_1}\ @^{\widetilde{S}_{11} \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_{12}}\ \varepsilon_2 t^{\widetilde{S}_2} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_{12} \widetilde{\Upsilon} \tilde{\ell}}}$$

$$\frac{t^{\widetilde{S}_1} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_1} \qquad \varepsilon_1 \vdash \widetilde{S}_1 \lesssim \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1} \qquad t^{\widetilde{S}_2} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_2} \qquad \varepsilon_2 \vdash \widetilde{S}_2 \lesssim (\widetilde{S}_2 \widetilde{\Upsilon} \widetilde{S}_3) \widetilde{\Upsilon} \tilde{\ell}_1 \qquad t^{\widetilde{S}_3} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_3} \qquad \varepsilon_3 \vdash \widetilde{S}_3 \lesssim (\widetilde{S}_2 \widetilde{\Upsilon} \widetilde{S}_3) \widetilde{\Upsilon} \tilde{\ell}_1}{\mathsf{if}\ \varepsilon_1 t^{\widetilde{S}_1}\ \mathsf{then}\ \varepsilon_2 t^{\widetilde{S}_2}\ \mathsf{else}\ \varepsilon_3 t^{\widetilde{S}_3} \in \text{TERM}_{(\widetilde{S}_2 \widetilde{\dot{\vee}} \widetilde{S}_3) \widetilde{\Upsilon} \tilde{\ell}_1}}$$

$$\frac{t^{\widetilde{S}_1} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_1} \qquad \varepsilon_1 \vdash \widetilde{S}_1 \lesssim \widetilde{S}_2}{\varepsilon_1 t^{\widetilde{S}_1} :: \widetilde{S}_2 \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_2}}$$

Figure 4. $\lambda_{\widetilde{\text{SEC}}}$: Gradual Intrinsic Terms

Intrinsic terms. Fig. 4 presents the intrinsic terms for $\lambda_{\widetilde{\text{SEC}}}$. Note that we do not need to introduce term stamping in this language. Since terms are intrinsically typed and we have ascriptions, labels can be stamped at the type level.

Reduction. Evaluation uses the *consistent transitivity* operator $\circ^{<:}$ to combine evidences:

$$\langle \widetilde{S}_1, \widetilde{S}_{21} \rangle \circ^{<:} \langle \widetilde{S}_{22}, \widetilde{S}_3 \rangle = \triangle^{<:}(\widetilde{S}_1, \widetilde{S}_{21} \sqcap \widetilde{S}_{22}, \widetilde{S}_3)$$

First we calculate a recursive meet operator for gradual types:

$$\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}} \sqcap \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}'} = \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell} \sqcap \tilde{\ell}'}$$
$$(\widetilde{S}_{11} \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_{12}) \sqcap (\widetilde{S}_{21} \to_{\tilde{\ell}'} \widetilde{S}_{22}) = (\widetilde{S}_{11} \sqcap \widetilde{S}_{21}) \to_{\tilde{\ell} \sqcap \tilde{\ell}'} (\widetilde{S}_{12} \sqcap \widetilde{S}_{22})$$
$$\widetilde{S} \sqcap \widetilde{S}' \text{ undefined otherwise}$$

where $\tilde{\ell} \sqcap \tilde{\ell}' = \alpha_{\ell}(\gamma_{\ell}(\tilde{\ell}) \cap \gamma_{\ell}(\tilde{\ell}'))$, or algorithmically:

$$\tilde{\ell} \sqcap ? = ? \sqcap \tilde{\ell} = \tilde{\ell}$$
$$\ell \sqcap \ell = \ell$$
$$\ell \sqcap \ell' \text{ undefined otherwise}$$

We calculate a recursive definition for $\triangle^{<:}$ by case analysis on the structure of the second argument,

$$\frac{\triangle^{\preccurlyeq}(\tilde{\ell}_1,\tilde{\ell}_2,\tilde{\ell}_3)=\langle\tilde{\ell}_1,\tilde{\ell}_3\rangle}{\triangle^{<:}(\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1},\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_2},\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_3})=\langle\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1},\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_3}\rangle}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c}\triangle^{<:}(\widetilde{S}_{31},\widetilde{S}_{21},\widetilde{S}_{11})=\langle\widetilde{S}_{31},\widetilde{S}_{11}\rangle\\ \triangle^{<:}(\widetilde{S}_{12},\widetilde{S}_{22},\widetilde{S}_{32})=\langle\widetilde{S}_{12},\widetilde{S}_{32}\rangle\\ \triangle^{\preccurlyeq}(\tilde{\ell}_1,\tilde{\ell}_2,\tilde{\ell}_3)=\langle\tilde{\ell}_1,\tilde{\ell}_3\rangle\end{array}}{\begin{array}{l}\triangle^{<:}(\widetilde{S}_{11}\to_{\tilde{\ell}_1}\widetilde{S}_{12},\widetilde{S}_{21}\to_{\tilde{\ell}_2}\widetilde{S}_{22},\widetilde{S}_{31}\to_{\tilde{\ell}_3}\widetilde{S}_{32})\\ =\langle\widetilde{S}_{11}\to_{\tilde{\ell}_1}\widetilde{S}_{12},\widetilde{S}_{31}\to_{\tilde{\ell}_3}\widetilde{S}_{32}\rangle\end{array}}$$

with the following definition of $\triangle^{\preccurlyeq}$, again calculated by case analysis on the middle gradual label:

$$\frac{\top\mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}}\tilde{\ell}_3}{\triangle^{\preccurlyeq}(\tilde{\ell}_1,\top,\tilde{\ell}_3)=\langle\tilde{\ell}_1,\top\rangle}\qquad\frac{\tilde{\ell}_1\mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}}\bot}{\triangle^{\preccurlyeq}(\tilde{\ell}_1,\bot,\tilde{\ell}_3)=\langle\bot,\tilde{\ell}_3\rangle}$$

$$\frac{\tilde{\ell}_1\mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}}\tilde{\ell}_2\quad\tilde{\ell}_2\mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}}\tilde{\ell}_3\quad\tilde{\ell}_2\notin\{\bot,\top\}}{\triangle^{\preccurlyeq}(\tilde{\ell}_1,\tilde{\ell}_2,\tilde{\ell}_3)=\langle\tilde{\ell}_1,\tilde{\ell}_3\rangle}$$

The reduction rules are given in Fig. 5. The evidence inversion functions reflect the contravariance on arguments and the need to stamp security labels on return types:

$$idom(\langle\widetilde{S}_1'\to_{\tilde{\ell}'}\widetilde{S}_2',\widetilde{S}_1'\to_{\tilde{\ell}''}\widetilde{S}_2''\rangle)=\langle\widetilde{S}_1'',\widetilde{S}_1'\rangle$$
$$icod(\langle\widetilde{S}_1'\to_{\tilde{\ell}'}\widetilde{S}_2',\widetilde{S}_1''\to_{\tilde{\ell}''}\widetilde{S}_2''\rangle)=\langle\widetilde{S}_2'\mathbin{\widetilde{\curlyvee}}\tilde{\ell}',\widetilde{S}_2''\mathbin{\widetilde{\curlyvee}}\tilde{\ell}''\rangle$$

3.5 Example

Consider a simple lattice with two confidentiality levels, $\mathsf{L}=\bot$ and $\mathsf{H}=\top$, and the following *extrinsic* program definitions:

f	$\triangleq$	$(\lambda x:\mathsf{Bool}_{\mathsf{L}}.x)_{\mathsf{L}}$	a public channel
g	$\triangleq$	$(\lambda x:\mathsf{Bool}_{?}.x)_{\mathsf{L}}$	an unknown channel that can be publicly used
v	$\triangleq$	$\mathsf{false}_{\mathsf{H}}$	a private value

$f\ v$ does not type check, but $f\ (g\ v)$ *does* typecheck, even though it fails at runtime. Type checking yields the corresponding *intrinsic* definitions:

$$(\langle\widetilde{S}_f,\widetilde{S}_f\rangle\,f)\mathbin{@^{\widetilde{S}_f}}\Big(\langle\mathsf{L},\mathsf{L}\rangle\,(\langle\widetilde{S}_g,\widetilde{S}_g\rangle\,g)\mathbin{@^{\widetilde{S}_g}}(\langle\mathsf{H},\mathsf{H}\rangle\,v)\Big)$$

where the intrinsic subterms are essentially identical to their extrinsic counterparts:

f	$\triangleq$	$(\lambda x^{\mathsf{Bool}_{\mathsf{L}}}.x)_{\mathsf{L}}$	a public channel
g	$\triangleq$	$(\lambda x^{\mathsf{Bool}_{?}}.x)_{\mathsf{L}}$	an unknown channel that can be publicly used
v	$\triangleq$	$\mathsf{false}_{\mathsf{H}}$	a private value

For conciseness, we abbreviate $\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}$ with $\tilde{\ell}$, use $\widetilde{S}_f$ and $\widetilde{S}_g$ to refer to the types of f and g, and elide the application operators $@^{\widetilde{S}}$. At each step, we use grey boxes to highlight the focus of reduction/rewriting, and underline the result.

$\varepsilon\in$ EVIDENCE, $et\in$ EVTERM, $ev\in$ EVVALUE, $u\in$ SIMPLEVALUE, $t\in\text{TERM}_*$, $v\in$ VALUE, $g\in$ EVFRAME, $f\in$ TMFRAME

$$\begin{array}{rcl}\varepsilon & ::= & \langle\widetilde{S},\widetilde{S}\rangle\\ et & ::= & \varepsilon t\\ ev & ::= & \varepsilon u\\ u & ::= & x\mid b_{\tilde{\ell}}\mid(\lambda x.t)_{\tilde{\ell}}\\ v & ::= & u\mid\varepsilon u::\widetilde{S}\\ g & ::= & \square\oplus^{\tilde{\ell}}et\mid ev\oplus^{\tilde{\ell}}\square\mid\square\mathbin{@^{\widetilde{S}}}et\mid ev\mathbin{@^{\widetilde{S}}}\square\mid\square::\widetilde{S}\\ & \mid & \mathsf{if}\ \square\ \mathsf{then}\ et\ \mathsf{else}\ et\\ f & ::= & g[\varepsilon\square]\end{array}$$

Notions of Reduction

$\longrightarrow$: $\text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}\times(\text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}\cup\{\,\mathbf{error}\,\})$

$$\langle\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1'},\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1''}\rangle\,(b_1)_{\tilde{\ell}_1}\oplus^{\tilde{\ell}}\langle\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_2'},\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_2''}\rangle\,(b_2)_{\tilde{\ell}_2}\longrightarrow\langle\mathsf{Bool}_{(\tilde{\ell}_1'\widetilde{\curlyvee}\tilde{\ell}_2')},\mathsf{Bool}_{(\tilde{\ell}_1''\widetilde{\curlyvee}\tilde{\ell}_2'')}\rangle\,(b_1\,[\![\oplus]\!]\,b_2)_{(\tilde{\ell}_1\widetilde{\curlyvee}\tilde{\ell}_2)}::\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}$$

$$\varepsilon_1(\lambda x^{\widetilde{S}_{11}}.t^*)_{\tilde{\ell}_1}\mathbin{@^{\widetilde{S}_1\to_{\tilde{\ell}}\widetilde{S}_2}}\varepsilon_2u\longrightarrow\begin{cases}icod(\varepsilon_1)([[(\varepsilon_2\circ^{<:}idom(\varepsilon_1))u::\widetilde{S}_{11})/x^{\widetilde{S}_1}]t^*)::\widetilde{S}_2\mathbin{\widetilde{\curlyvee}}\tilde{\ell}\\ \mathbf{error}\quad\text{if }(\varepsilon_2\circ^{<:}idom(\varepsilon_1))\text{ not defined}\end{cases}$$

$$\mathsf{if}\ \varepsilon_1b_{\tilde{\ell}}\ \mathsf{then}\ \varepsilon_2t^{\widetilde{S}_2}\ \mathsf{else}\ \varepsilon_3t^{\widetilde{S}_3}\longrightarrow\begin{cases}\varepsilon_2t^{\widetilde{S}_2}::(\widetilde{S}_2\mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}}\widetilde{S}_3)\mathbin{\widetilde{\curlyvee}}\tilde{\ell}\quad b=\mathsf{true}\\ \varepsilon_3t^{\widetilde{S}_3}::(\widetilde{S}_2\mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}}\widetilde{S}_3)\mathbin{\widetilde{\curlyvee}}\tilde{\ell}\quad b=\mathsf{false}\end{cases}$$

$\longrightarrow_c$: $\text{EVTERM}\times(\text{EVTERM}\cup\{\,\mathbf{error}\,\})$

$$\varepsilon_1(\varepsilon_2v::\widetilde{S})\longrightarrow_c\begin{cases}(\varepsilon_2\circ^{<:}\varepsilon_1)v\\ \mathbf{error}\quad\text{if not defined}\end{cases}$$

Reduction

$\longmapsto$: $\text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}\times(\text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}\cup\{\,\mathbf{error}\,\})$

$$(\mathrm{R}\longrightarrow)\frac{t^{\widetilde{S}}\longrightarrow r\quad r\in(\text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}\cup\{\,\mathbf{error}\,\})}{t^{\widetilde{S}}\longmapsto r}$$

$$(\mathrm{R}g)\frac{et\longrightarrow_c et'}{g[et]\longmapsto g[r]}\qquad(\mathrm{R}g\mathrm{err})\frac{et\longrightarrow_c\mathbf{error}}{g[et]\longmapsto\mathbf{error}}$$

$$(\mathrm{R}f)\frac{t_1^{\widetilde{S}}\longmapsto t_2^{\widetilde{S}}}{f[t_1^{\widetilde{S}}]\longmapsto f[t_2^{\widetilde{S}}]}\qquad(\mathrm{R}f\mathrm{err})\frac{t_1^{\widetilde{S}}\longmapsto\mathbf{error}}{f[t_1^{\widetilde{S}}]\longmapsto\mathbf{error}}$$

Figure 5. $\lambda_{\widetilde{\text{SEC}}}$: Intrinsic Reduction

$$\begin{array}{ll}& (\langle\widetilde{S}_f,\widetilde{S}_f\rangle\,f)\ \big(\ \langle\mathsf{L},\mathsf{L}\rangle\ ((\langle\widetilde{S}_g,\widetilde{S}_g\rangle\ g\ )\ (\langle\mathsf{H},\mathsf{H}\rangle\ v))\big)\\ =& (\langle\widetilde{S}_f,\widetilde{S}_f\rangle\,f)\ \big(\ \langle\mathsf{L},\mathsf{L}\rangle\ (\ (\langle\widetilde{S}_g,\widetilde{S}_g\rangle\ \underline{(\lambda x^{?}.x)_{\mathsf{L}}^{\widetilde{S}_g}}\ )\ (\langle\mathsf{H},\mathsf{H}\rangle\ v)\ )\big)\\ \longrightarrow& (\langle\widetilde{S}_f,\widetilde{S}_f\rangle\,f)\ \big(\ \langle\mathsf{L},\mathsf{L}\rangle\ (?,?([\ (\langle\mathsf{H},\mathsf{H}\rangle\circ^{<:}\langle?,?\rangle)\ v::?/x]x)::?)\big)\\ =_{\circ<:}& (\langle\widetilde{S}_f,\widetilde{S}_f\rangle\,f)\ \big(\ \langle\mathsf{L},\mathsf{L}\rangle\ (?,?(\ \underline{[\langle\mathsf{H},\mathsf{H}\rangle v::?/x]x}\ )::?)\big)\\ =_{[t/t]t}& (\langle\widetilde{S}_f,\widetilde{S}_f\rangle\,f)\ \big(\ \langle\mathsf{L},\mathsf{L}\rangle\ (\ ?,?(\underline{\langle\mathsf{H},\mathsf{H}\rangle v::?}\ )\ ::?)\big)\\ \longrightarrow_c& (\langle\widetilde{S}_f,\widetilde{S}_f\rangle\,f)\ \big(\ \langle\mathsf{L},\mathsf{L}\rangle\ (\ \underline{(\langle\mathsf{H},\mathsf{H}\rangle\circ^{<:}\langle?,?\rangle)\ v::?}\ )\big)\\ =_{\circ<:}& (\langle\widetilde{S}_f,\widetilde{S}_f\rangle\,f)\ \big(\ \underline{\langle\mathsf{L},\mathsf{L}\rangle\ (\langle\mathsf{H},\mathsf{H}\rangle v::?)}\ \big)\\ \longrightarrow_c& (\langle\widetilde{S}_f,\widetilde{S}_f\rangle\,f)\ \big(\underline{\mathbf{error}}\big)\end{array}$$

because $\langle\mathsf{H},\mathsf{H}\rangle\circ^{<:}\langle\mathsf{L},\mathsf{L}\rangle=\triangle^{<:}(\mathsf{H},\mathsf{H}\sqcap\mathsf{L},\mathsf{L})$
which is undefined because $\mathsf{H}\sqcap\mathsf{L}$ is undefined.

4. Noninterference for $\lambda_{\widetilde{\mathbf{SEC}}}$

We establish noninterference for the gradual security language using logical relations, adapting the technique from Zdancewic (2002).

First, in the intrinsic setting, the type environment related to an open term t is simply the set of (intrinsically-typed) free variables of the term, $FV(t)$. We use the metavariable $\Gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\text{VAR}_*)$ to denote such "type-environments-as-sets".

Informally, the noninterference theorem states that a program with low (visible) output and a high (private) input can be run with different high-security values and, if terminating, will always yield the same observable value.[2]

Theorem 10 (Noninterference). *if $t \in \text{TERM}_{\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}}$ with $FV(t) = \{x\}, x \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}$, and $v_1, v_2 \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}$ with $label(\widetilde{S}) \not\precsim \tilde{\ell}$, then*

$$t[v_1/x] \longmapsto^* v_1' \wedge t[v_2/x] \longmapsto^* v_2' \Rightarrow bval(v_1') = bval(v_2')$$

Proof. The result follows by using the method of logical relations (following Zdancewic (2002)), as a special case of Lemma 15 below. □

Note that we compare equality of bare values at base types, stripping the checking-related information (labels, evidences and ascriptions): *i.e.* $bval(b_{\tilde{\ell}}) = b$ and $bval(\varepsilon b_{\tilde{\ell}} :: \widetilde{S}) = b$. Also, gradual programs can fail. We establish *termination-insensitive* noninterference, meaning in particular that any program may run into an **error** without violating noninterference.

Definition 14 (Gradual security logical relations). *For an arbitrary element ζ of the security lattice, the ζ-level gradual security relations are type-indexed binary relations on closed terms defined inductively as presented in Figure 6. The notation $v_1 \approx_\zeta v_2 : \widetilde{S}$ indicates that v_1 is related to v_2 at type $\widetilde{S}$ when observed at the security level ζ. Similarly, the notation $t_1 \approx_\zeta t_2 : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S})$ indicates that t_1 and t_2 are related computations that produce related values at type $\widetilde{S}$ when observed at the security level ζ.*

The logical relations are very similar to those of Zdancewic (2002), except for the points discussed above and the fact that we account for subtyping in the relation between values at a function type (recall that our type system is syntax-directed).

Definition 15 (Secure program). *A well-typed program t that produces a ζ-observable output of type $\widetilde{S}$ (*i.e. *$label(\widetilde{S}) \precsim \zeta$) is secure iff $t \approx_\zeta t : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S})$.*

Definition 16 (Related substitutions). *Two substitutions σ_1 and σ_2 are related, notation $\Gamma \vdash \sigma_1 \approx_\zeta \sigma_2$, if $\sigma_i \models \Gamma$ and $\forall x^{\widetilde{S}} \in \Gamma. \sigma_1(x^{\widetilde{S}}) \approx_\zeta \sigma_2(x^{\widetilde{S}}) : \widetilde{S}$.*

Lemma 11 (Substitution preserves typing). *If $t^{\widetilde{S}} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}$ and $\sigma \models FV(t^{\widetilde{S}})$ then $\sigma(t^{\widetilde{S}}) \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}$.*

Proof. By induction on the derivation of $t^{\widetilde{S}} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}$ □

Lemma 12 (Reduction preserves relations). *Consider $t_1, t_2 \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}$. Posing $t_i \longmapsto^* t_i'$, we have $t_1 \approx_\zeta t_2 : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S})$ if and only if $t_1' \approx_\zeta t_2' : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S})$*

[2] The *label* function returns the top-level security label of the given type: $label(\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}) = \tilde{\ell}$ and $label(\widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2) = \tilde{\ell}$.

Proof. Direct by definition of $t_1 \approx_\zeta t_2 : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S})$ and transitivity of $\longmapsto^*$. □

Lemma 13 (Canonical forms). *Consider a value $v \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}$. Then either $v = u$, or $v = \varepsilon u :: \widetilde{S}$ with $u \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}'}$ and $\varepsilon \vdash \widetilde{S}' \lesssim \widetilde{S}$. Furthermore:*

1. *If $\widetilde{S} = \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}$ then either $v = b_{\tilde{\ell}}$ or $v = \varepsilon b_{\tilde{\ell}'} :: \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}$ with $b_{\tilde{\ell}'} \in \text{TERM}_{\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}'}}$ and $\varepsilon \vdash \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}'} \lesssim \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}$.*
2. *If $\widetilde{S} = \widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2$ then either $v = (\lambda x^{\widetilde{S}_1}.t^{\widetilde{S}_2})_{\tilde{\ell}}$ with $t^{\widetilde{S}_2} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_2}$ or $v = \varepsilon(\lambda x^{\widetilde{S}_1'}.t^{\widetilde{S}_2'})_{\tilde{\ell}'} :: \widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2$ with $t^{\widetilde{S}_2'} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}_2'}$ and $\varepsilon \vdash \widetilde{S}_1' \to_{\tilde{\ell}'} \widetilde{S}_2' \lesssim \widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2$.*

Proof. By direct inspection of the formation rules of gradual intrinsic terms (Figure 4). □

Lemma 14 (Ascription preserves relation). *Suppose $\varepsilon \vdash \widetilde{S}' \lesssim \widetilde{S}$.*

1. *If $v_1 \approx_\zeta v_2 : \widetilde{S}'$ then $(\varepsilon v_1 :: \widetilde{S}) \approx_\zeta (\varepsilon v_2 :: \widetilde{S}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S})$.*
2. *If $t_1 \approx_\zeta t_2 : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}')$ then $(\varepsilon t_1 :: \widetilde{S}) \approx_\zeta (\varepsilon t_2 :: \widetilde{S}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S})$.*

Proof. Following Zdancewic (2002), the proof proceeds by induction on the judgment $\varepsilon \vdash \widetilde{S}' \lesssim \widetilde{S}$. The difference here is that consistent subtyping is justified by evidence, and that the terms have to be ascribed to exploit subtyping. In particular, case 1 above establishes a computation-level relation because each ascribed term $(\varepsilon v_i :: \widetilde{S})$ may not be a value: each value v_i is either a bare value u_i or a casted value $\varepsilon_i u_i :: \widetilde{S}_i$, with $\varepsilon_i \vdash S_i \lesssim \widetilde{S}$. In the latter case, $(\varepsilon(\varepsilon_i u_i :: \widetilde{S}_i) :: \widetilde{S})$ either steps to **error** (in which case the relation is vacuously established), or steps to $\varepsilon' u_i :: \widetilde{S}$, which is a value. □

Noninterference follows directly from the following lemma, which establishes that substitution preserves the logical relations:

Lemma 15 (Substitution preserves relation). *If $t^{\widetilde{S}} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}$, $\Gamma = FV(t^{\widetilde{S}})$, and $\Gamma \vdash \sigma_1 \approx_\zeta \sigma_2$, then $\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}}) \approx_\zeta \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S})$.*

Proof. By induction on the derivation that $t \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}$. Considering the last step used in the derivation:

Case (x). $t^{\widetilde{S}} = x^{\widetilde{S}}$ so $\Gamma = \{x^{\widetilde{S}}\}$. $\Gamma \vdash \sigma_1 \approx_\zeta \sigma_2$ implies by definition that $\sigma_1(x^{\widetilde{S}}) \approx_\zeta \sigma_2(x^{\widetilde{S}}) : \widetilde{S}$.

———

Case (b). $t^{\widetilde{S}} = b_{\tilde{\ell}}$. By definition of substitution, $\sigma_1(b_{\tilde{\ell}}) = \sigma_2(b_{\tilde{\ell}}) = b_{\tilde{\ell}}$. By definition, $b_{\tilde{\ell}} \approx_\zeta b_{\tilde{\ell}} : \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}$ as required.

———

Case (λ). $t^{\widetilde{S}} = (\lambda x^{\widetilde{S}_1}.t^{\widetilde{S}_2})_{\tilde{\ell}}$. Then $\widetilde{S} = \widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2$.

By definition of substitution, assuming $x^{\widetilde{S}_1} \notin dom(\sigma_i)$, and Lemma 11:

$$\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}}) = (\lambda x^{\widetilde{S}_1}.\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}))_{\tilde{\ell}} \in \text{TERM}_{\widetilde{S}}$$

If $\tilde{\ell} \not\precsim \zeta$ the result holds trivially because all function values are related in such a cases. Assume $\tilde{\ell} \precsim \zeta$, and assume two values v_1 and v_2 such that $v_1 \approx_\zeta v_2 : \widetilde{S}_1'$, with $\varepsilon_2 \vdash \widetilde{S}_1' \lesssim \widetilde{S}_1$. (We omit the $@^{\widetilde{S}}$ operator in applications below since we simply pick

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
v_1 \approx_\zeta v_2 : \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}} & \iff & v_i \in \textsc{Term}_{\mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}} \wedge \tilde{\ell} \mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}} \zeta \implies bval(v_1) = bval(v_2) \\
v_1 \approx_\zeta v_2 : \widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2 & \iff & v_i \in \textsc{Term}_{\widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2} \wedge \tilde{\ell} \mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}} \zeta \implies \forall \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \widetilde{S}_1' \to_{\tilde{\ell}'} \widetilde{S}_2', \text{ and } \widetilde{S}_1'' \text{ such that} \\
& & \varepsilon_1 \vdash \widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2 \lesssim \widetilde{S}_1' \to_{\tilde{\ell}'} \widetilde{S}_2' \text{ and } \varepsilon_2 \vdash \widetilde{S}_1'' \lesssim \widetilde{S}_1', \text{ we have:} \\
& & \forall v_1' \approx_\zeta v_2' : \widetilde{S}_1''.\ (\varepsilon_1 v_1 \ @^{\widetilde{S}_1' \to_{\tilde{\ell}'} \widetilde{S}_2'}\ \varepsilon_2 v_1') \approx_\zeta (\varepsilon_1 v_2 \ @^{\widetilde{S}_1' \to_{\tilde{\ell}'} \widetilde{S}_2'}\ \varepsilon_2 v_2') : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_2 \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} \tilde{\ell}) \\
t_1 \approx_\zeta t_2 : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}) & \iff & t_i \in \textsc{Term}_{\widetilde{S}} \wedge (t_1 \longmapsto^* v_1 \wedge t_2 \longmapsto^* v_2 \implies v_1 \approx_\zeta v_2 : \widetilde{S})
\end{array}
$$

Figure 6. Gradual security logical relations

$\widetilde{S} = \widetilde{S}_1 \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_2$.)
We need to show that:

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
& \varepsilon_1(\lambda x^{\widetilde{S}_1}.\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}))_{\tilde{\ell}}\ \varepsilon_2 v_1 \\
\approx_\zeta & \varepsilon_1(\lambda x^{\widetilde{S}_1}.\sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}))_{\tilde{\ell}}\ \varepsilon_2 v_2 \quad : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_2 \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} \tilde{\ell})
\end{array}
$$

Each v_i is either a bare value u_i or a casted value $\varepsilon_{2i} u_i :: \widetilde{S}_1'$. In the latter case, the application expression combines evidence, which may fail with **error**. If it succeeds, we call the combined evidence ε_{2i}'. The application rule then applies: it may fail with **error** if the evidence ε_{2i}' cannot be combined with the evidence for the function parameter. In all of the failure cases, the relation vacuously holds. We therefore consider the only interesting case, where the applications succeed. We have:

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
& \varepsilon_1(\lambda x^{\widetilde{S}_1}.\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}))_{\tilde{\ell}}\ \varepsilon_{2i}' u_i \\
\longmapsto & \varepsilon_r([\varepsilon_a u_i :: \widetilde{S}_1 / x^{\widetilde{S}_1}]\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_2})) :: \widetilde{S}_2 \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} \tilde{\ell}
\end{array}
$$

where ε_r and ε_{ai} are the new evidences for the return value and argument, respectively. We then extend the substitutions to map $x^{\widetilde{S}_1}$ to the casted arguments:

$$\sigma_i' = \sigma_i\{x^{\widetilde{S}_1} \mapsto \varepsilon_a u_i :: \widetilde{S}_1\}$$

By Lemma 14.1, $(\varepsilon_{a1} u_1 :: \widetilde{S}_1) \approx_\zeta (\varepsilon_{a2} u_2 :: \widetilde{S}_1) : \widetilde{S}_1$
So $\Gamma, x^{\widetilde{S}_1} \vdash \sigma_1' \approx_\zeta \sigma_2'$. By induction hypothesis:

$$\sigma_1'(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) \approx_\zeta \sigma_2'(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_2)$$

By the definition of substitution, this is exactly:

$$[\varepsilon_a u_1 :: \widetilde{S}_1 / x^{\widetilde{S}_1}]\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) \approx_\zeta [\varepsilon_a u_2 :: \widetilde{S}_1 / x^{\widetilde{S}_1}]\sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_2)$$

Finally, since $\varepsilon_r \vdash \widetilde{S}_2 \lesssim \widetilde{S}_2 \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} \tilde{\ell}$, by Lemma 14.2:

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
& \varepsilon_r[\varepsilon_a u_1 :: \widetilde{S}_1 / x^{\widetilde{S}_1}]\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) :: \widetilde{S}_2 \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} \tilde{\ell} \\
\approx_\zeta & \varepsilon_r[\varepsilon_a u_2 :: \widetilde{S}_1 / x^{\widetilde{S}_1}]\sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) :: \widetilde{S}_2 \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} \tilde{\ell} \quad : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_2 \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} \tilde{\ell})
\end{array}
$$

By backward preservation of the relations (Lemma 12), this implies that:

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
& \varepsilon_1(\lambda x^{\widetilde{S}_1}.\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}))_{\tilde{\ell}}\ \varepsilon_2 v_1 \\
\approx_\zeta & \varepsilon_1(\lambda x^{\widetilde{S}_1}.\sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}))_{\tilde{\ell}}\ \varepsilon_2 v_2 \quad : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_2 \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} \tilde{\ell})
\end{array}
$$

Case ($\oplus$). $t^{\widetilde{S}} = \varepsilon_1 t^{\widetilde{S}_1}\ \oplus^{\tilde{\ell}}\ \varepsilon_2 t^{\widetilde{S}_2}$

By definition of substitution and Lemma 11:

$$\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}}) = \varepsilon_1 \sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_1})\ \oplus^{\tilde{\ell}}\ \varepsilon_2 \sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) \in \textsc{Term}_{\widetilde{S}}$$

By induction hypotheses:

$$\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) \approx_\zeta \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_1) \text{ and } \sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) \approx_\zeta \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_2)$$

By definition of related computations:

$$
\begin{array}{l}
\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) \longmapsto^* v_{11} \wedge \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) \longmapsto^* v_{21} \Rightarrow v_{11} \approx_\zeta v_{21} : \widetilde{S}_1 \\
\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) \longmapsto^* v_{12} \wedge \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) \longmapsto^* v_{22} \Rightarrow v_{12} \approx_\zeta v_{22} : \widetilde{S}_2
\end{array}
$$

By Lemma 13, each v_{ij} is either a boolean $(b_{ij})_{\tilde{\ell}_{ij}}$ or a casted boolean $\varepsilon_{ij}(b_{ij})_{\tilde{\ell}_{ij}'} :: \widetilde{S}_j$. In case a value v_{ij} is a casted value, then the whole term $\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}})$ can take a step by (Rg), combining ε_i with ε_{ij}. Such a step either fails, or succeeds with a new combined evidence. Therefore, either:

$$\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}}) \longmapsto^* \textbf{error}$$

in which case we do not care since we only consider termination-insensitive noninterference, or:

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}}) & \longmapsto^* & \varepsilon_1'(b_{i1})_{\tilde{\ell}_{i1}'}\ \oplus^{\tilde{\ell}}\ \varepsilon_2'(b_{i2})_{\tilde{\ell}_{i2}'} \\
& \longmapsto & \varepsilon'(b_i)_{\tilde{\ell}_i'} :: \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}
\end{array}
$$

with $b_i = b_{i1} [\![\oplus]\!] b_{i2}$ and $\tilde{\ell}_i' = \tilde{\ell}_{i1}' \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} \tilde{\ell}_{i2}'$. It remains to show that:

$$(b_1)_{\tilde{\ell}_1'} \approx_\zeta (b_2)_{\tilde{\ell}_2'} : \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}}$$

If $\tilde{\ell} \not\mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}} \zeta$, then the result holds trivially because all boolean values are related. If $\tilde{\ell} \mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}} \zeta$, then also $\tilde{\ell}_i' \mathrel{\widetilde{\preccurlyeq}} \zeta$, which means by definition of $\approx_\zeta$ on boolean values, that $b_{11} = b_{21}$ and $b_{12} = b_{22}$, so $b_1 = b_2$.

Case (app). $t^{\widetilde{S}} = \varepsilon_1 t^{\widetilde{S}_1}\ @^{\widetilde{S}_{11} \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_{12}}\ \varepsilon_2 t^{\widetilde{S}_2}$
with $\varepsilon_1 \vdash \widetilde{S}_1 \lesssim S_{11} \to_{\tilde{\ell}} S_{12}$, $\varepsilon_2 \vdash \widetilde{S}_2 \lesssim \widetilde{S}_{11}$, and $\widetilde{S} = \widetilde{S}_{12} \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} \tilde{\ell}$.
We omit the $@^{\widetilde{S}_{11} \to_{\tilde{\ell}} \widetilde{S}_{12}}$ operator in applications below.

By definition of substitution and Lemma 11:

$$\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}}) = \varepsilon_1 \sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_1})\ \varepsilon_2 \sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) \in \textsc{Term}_{\widetilde{S}}$$

By induction hypothesis:

$$\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) \approx_\zeta \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_1) \text{ and } \sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) \approx_\zeta \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_2)$$

By definition of related computations:

$$
\begin{array}{l}
\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) \longmapsto^* v_{11} \wedge \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) \longmapsto^* v_{21} \Rightarrow v_{11} \approx_\zeta v_{21} : \widetilde{S}_1 \\
\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) \longmapsto^* v_{12} \wedge \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) \longmapsto^* v_{22} \Rightarrow v_{12} \approx_\zeta v_{22} : \widetilde{S}_2
\end{array}
$$

By definition of $\approx_\zeta$ at values of function type, using ε_1 and ε_2 to justify the subtyping relations, we have:

$$(\varepsilon_1 v_{11}\ \varepsilon_2 v_{12}) \approx_\zeta (\varepsilon_1 v_{21}\ \varepsilon_2 v_{22}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_{12} \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} \tilde{\ell})$$

Case (if). $t^{\widetilde{S}} = \mathsf{if}\ \varepsilon_1 t^{\widetilde{S}_1}\ \mathsf{then}\ \varepsilon_2 t^{\widetilde{S}_2}\ \mathsf{else}\ \varepsilon_3 t^{\widetilde{S}_3}$, with $t^{\widetilde{S}_i} \in \textsc{Term}_{\widetilde{S}_i}$, $\varepsilon_1 \vdash \widetilde{S}_1 \lesssim \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1}$ and $\widetilde{S} = (\widetilde{S}_2 \ddot{\vee} \widetilde{S}_3)\,\widetilde{\gamma}\,\tilde{\ell}_1$
By definition of substitution:

$$\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}}) = \mathsf{if}\ \varepsilon_1\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_1})\ \mathsf{then}\ \varepsilon_2\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_2})\ \mathsf{else}\ \varepsilon_3\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_3})$$

If $\tilde{\ell} \not\preccurlyeq \zeta$, then $\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}}) \approx_\zeta \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S})$ holds trivially because the $\approx_\zeta$ relations relate all such well-typed terms. Let us assume $\tilde{\ell} \precsim \zeta$. By the induction hypothesis we have that:

$$\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) \approx_\zeta \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_1)$$

Assuming $\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) \longmapsto^* v_{i1}$, by the definition of $\approx_\zeta$ we have:

$$v_{11} \approx_\zeta v_{21} : \widetilde{S}_1$$

By Lemma 13, each v_{i1} is either a boolean $(b_{i1})_{\tilde{\ell}_{i1}}$ or a casted boolean $\varepsilon_{i1}(b_{i1})_{\tilde{\ell}'_{i1}} :: \widetilde{S}_1$. In either case, $\widetilde{S}_1 \lesssim \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}_1}$ implies $\widetilde{S}_1 = \mathsf{Bool}_{\tilde{\ell}'_1}$, so by definition of $\approx_\zeta$ on boolean values, $b_{11} = b_{21}$.
In case a value v_{i1} is a casted value, then the whole term $\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}})$ can take a step by (Rg), combining ε_i with ε_{i1}. Such a step either fails, or succeeds with a new combined evidence. Therefore, either:

$$\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}}) \longmapsto^* \textbf{error}$$

in which case we do not care since we only consider termination-insensitive noninterference, or:

$$\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}}) \quad \longmapsto^* \quad \mathsf{if}\ \varepsilon'_1(b_{i1})_{\tilde{\ell}'_1}\ \mathsf{then}\ \varepsilon_2\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_2})\ \mathsf{else}\ \varepsilon_3\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_3})$$

Because $b_{11} = b_{21}$, both $\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}})$ and $\sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}})$ step into the same branch of the conditional. Let us assume the condition is true (the other case is similar). Then:

$$\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}}) \longmapsto \varepsilon_2\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) :: \widetilde{S}$$

By induction hypothesis:

$$\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) \approx_\zeta \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_2)$$

Assume $\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) \longmapsto^* v_{i2}$, then $v_{12} \approx_\zeta v_{22} : \widetilde{S}_2$. Since $\varepsilon_2 \vdash \widetilde{S}_2 \lesssim \widetilde{S}$, by Lemma 14 we have:

$$(\varepsilon_2\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) :: \widetilde{S}) \approx_\zeta (\varepsilon_2\sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_2}) :: \widetilde{S}) :: \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S})$$

Case (::). $t^{\widetilde{S}} = \varepsilon t^{\widetilde{S}_1} :: \widetilde{S}$, with $t^{\widetilde{S}_1} \in \textsc{Term}_{\widetilde{S}_1}$ and $\varepsilon_1 \vdash \widetilde{S}_1 \lesssim \widetilde{S}$.
By definition of substitution:

$$\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}}) = \varepsilon_1\sigma_i(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) :: \widetilde{S}$$

By induction hypothesis:

$$\sigma_1(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) \approx_\zeta \sigma_2(t^{\widetilde{S}_1}) : \mathcal{C}(\widetilde{S}_1)$$

The result follows directly by Lemma 14.

□

5. Related Work and Conclusion

The design of a gradual security-typed language is a novel contribution. Despite the fact that both Disney and Flanagan (2011) and Fennell and Thiemann (2013) have proposed languages for security typing dubbed gradual, they do not propose gradual source languages. Rather, the language designs require explicit security casts—which can also be encoded with a label test expression in Jif (Zheng and Myers 2007). Furthermore, both designs treat an unlabeled type as having the top label, then allowing explicit casts downward in the security lattice. This design is analogous to the internal language of the quasi-static typing approach. In that approach, explicit casts work well, but the external language there accepts too many programs. That difficulty was the original motivation for consistency in gradual typing (Siek and Taha 2006).

Thiemann and Fennell (2014) develop a generic approach to gradualize annotated type systems. This is similar to security typing (labels are one kind of annotation), except that they only consider annotation on base types, and the language only includes explicit casts, like the gradual security work discussed above. They track blame and provide a translation that removes unnecessary casts.

Acknowledgments We thank Matías Toro for feedback and contributing the proofs of Propositions 1 and 2 in Appendix A.

References

F. Bañados Schwerter, R. Garcia, and É. Tanter. A theory of gradual effect systems. In *19th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP 2014)*, pages 283–295, Gothenburg, Sweden, Sept. 2014. ACM Press.

T. Disney and C. Flanagan. Gradual information flow typing. In *International Workshop on Scripts to Programs*, 2011.

L. Fennell and P. Thiemann. Gradual security typing with references. In *Computer Security Foundations Symposium*, pages 224–239, June 2013.

R. Garcia, A. M. Clark, and É. Tanter. Abstracting gradual typing. In *43rd ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL 2016)*, St Petersburg, FL, USA, Jan. 2016. ACM Press.

J. G. Siek and W. Taha. Gradual typing for functional languages. In *Scheme and Functional Programming Workshop*, pages 81–92, Sept. 2006.

P. Thiemann and L. Fennell. Gradual typing for annotated type systems. In Z. Shao, editor, *23rd European Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems (ESOP 2014)*, volume 8410 of *LNCS*, pages 47–66, Grenoble, France, 2014. Springer-Verlag.

S. Zdancewic. *Programming Languages for Information Security*. PhD thesis, Cornell University, Aug. 2002.

L. Zheng and A. C. Myers. Dynamic security labels and noninterference. *International Journal of Information Security*, 6(2):67–84, Mar. 2007.

A. Auxiliary Proofs

Proposition 1. *If* $\Gamma \vdash t : S$ *then* $\Gamma \vdash^Z t : S$.

Proof. By induction on $\Gamma \vdash t : S$.

As most of the type rules are identical, most of the cases are straightforward. The exceptions to this are the (Sif) and (Sapp) rules.

Case (Sif). Then

$$\mathcal{D} = \dfrac{\overset{\mathcal{D}_0}{\Gamma \vdash t_0 : \mathsf{Bool}_\ell} \quad \overset{\mathcal{D}_1}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : S_1} \quad \overset{\mathcal{D}_2}{\Gamma \vdash t_2 : S_2}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{if}\ t_0\ \mathsf{then}\ t_1\ \mathsf{else}\ t_2 : (S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)\,\gamma\,\ell}$$

By Lemma 16, $S_1 <: (S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$ and $S_2 <: (S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$, and by Lemma 17 $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2) <: (S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)\gamma\ell$, therefore $S_1 <: (S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)\gamma\ell$ and $S_2 <: (S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)\,\gamma\,\ell$.
Combining these with the induction hypotheses, we get

$$\mathcal{E} = \dfrac{\overset{\mathcal{E}_0}{\Gamma \vdash^Z t_0 : \mathsf{Bool}_\ell} \quad \dfrac{\overset{\mathcal{E}_i}{\Gamma \vdash^Z t_i : S_i} \quad S_i <: (S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)\,\gamma\,\ell}{\Gamma \vdash^Z t_i : (S_i \ddot{\vee} S_2)\,\gamma\,\ell}}{\Gamma \vdash^Z \mathsf{if}\ t_0\ \mathsf{then}\ t_1\ \mathsf{else}\ t_2 : (S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)\,\gamma\,\ell}$$

Case (Sapp). Then $t = t_1\ t_2$ and $\Gamma \vdash t_1\ t_2 : S_{12} \curlyvee \ell$ for some S_{12} and ℓ such that $\Gamma \vdash t_1 : S_{11} \to_\ell S_{12}$, $\Gamma \vdash t_2 : S_2$ and $S_2 <: S_{11}$. Using induction hypothesis on t_2 we know that $\Gamma \vdash^Z t_2 : S_2$. As $S_2 <: S_{11}$. Then by (λ_{SEC}-SUB) $\Gamma \vdash^Z t_2 : S_{11}$. Using induction hypothesis on t_1, $\Gamma \vdash^Z t_1 : S_{11} \to_\ell S_{12}$, then by ($\lambda_{\text{SEC}}$-APP) we conclude that $\Gamma \vdash^Z t_1\ t_2 : S_{12} \curlyvee \ell$

□

Lemma 16. *Let $S_1, S_2 \in$ TYPE. Then*

1. *If $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$ is defined then $S_1 <: (S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$.*
2. *If $(S_1 \ddot{\wedge} S_2)$ is defined then $(S_1 \ddot{\wedge} S_2) <: S_1$.*

Proof. We start by proving (1) assuming that $(S_1 \curlyvee S_2)$ is defined. We proceed by case analysis on S_1.

Case (Bool_ℓ). If $S_1 = \mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_1}$ then as $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$ is defined then S_2 must have the form Bool_{ℓ_2} for some ℓ_2. Therefore $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2) = \mathsf{Bool}_{(\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2)}$. But by definition of $\preccurlyeq$, $\ell_1 \preccurlyeq (\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2)$ and therefore we use ($<:_{\mathsf{Bool}}$) to conclude that $\mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_1} <: \mathsf{Bool}_{(\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2)}$, i.e. $S_1 <: (S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$.

Case ($S \to_\ell S$). If $S_1 = S_{11} \to_{\ell_1} S_{12}$ then as $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$ is defined then S_2 must have the form $S_{21} \to_{\ell_2} S_{22}$ for some S_{21}, S_{22} and ℓ_2.
We also know that $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2) = (S_{11} \ddot{\wedge} S_{21}) \to_{(\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2)} (S_{12} \ddot{\wedge} S_{22})$. By definition of $\preccurlyeq$, $\ell_1 \preccurlyeq (\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2)$. Also, as $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$ is defined then $(S_{11} \ddot{\wedge} S_{21})$ is defined. Using the induction hypothesis of (2) on S_{11}, $(S_{11} \ddot{\wedge} S_{21}) <: S_{11}$. Also, using the induction hypothesis of (1) on S_{12} we also know that $S_{12} <: (S_{12} \ddot{\wedge} S_{22})$. Then by ($<:_\to$) we can conclude that $S_{11} \to_{\ell_1} S_{12} <: (S_{11} \ddot{\wedge} S_{21}) \to_{(\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2)} (S_{12} \ddot{\wedge} S_{22})$, i.e. $S_1 <: (S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$.

The proof of (2) is similar to (1) but using the argument that $(\ell_1 \curlywedge \ell_2) \preccurlyeq \ell_1$. □

Lemma 17. *Let $S \in$ TYPE and $\ell \in$ LABEL. Then $S <: S \curlyvee \ell$.*

Proof. Straigthforward case analysis on type S using the fact that $\ell \preccurlyeq (\ell' \curlyvee \ell)$ for any ℓ'. □

Lemma 18. *Let $S_1, S_2 \in$ TYPE such that $S_1 <: S_2$, and let $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in$ LABEL such that $\ell_1 \preccurlyeq \ell_2$. Then $S_1 \curlyvee \ell_1 <: S_2 \curlyvee \ell_2$.*

Proof. Straightforward case analysis on type S using the definition of *label stamping* on types. □

Proposition 2. *If $\Gamma \vdash^Z t : S$ Then $\Gamma \vdash t : S'$ for some $S' <: S$.*

Proof. By induction on derivations of $\Gamma \vdash^Z t : S$.

We proceed by case analysis on t (modulo (λ_{SEC}-SUB)). As most of the type rules are identical, most of the cases are straightforward. The exception to this is case (λ_{SEC}-COND) and (λ_{SEC}-APP):

Case (λ_{SEC}-COND). Then $t = \mathsf{if}\ t'\ \mathsf{then}\ t_1\ \mathsf{else}\ t_2$ and $\Gamma \vdash^Z \mathsf{if}\ t'\ \mathsf{then}\ t_1\ \mathsf{else}\ t_2 : S_z \curlyvee \ell$ for some S_z, and l such that $\Gamma \vdash^Z t' : \mathsf{Bool}_\ell$, $\Gamma \vdash^Z t_1 : S \curlyvee \ell$ and $\Gamma \vdash^Z t_2 : S \curlyvee \ell$.
Using induction hypothesis on the premises we also know that $\Gamma \vdash t' : \mathsf{Bool}_{\ell'}$ for some $\ell' \preccurlyeq \ell$, $\Gamma \vdash t_1 : S_1'$ for some $S_1' <: S \curlyvee \ell$, and $\Gamma \vdash t_2 : S_2'$ for some $S_2' <: S \curlyvee \ell$.
By (Sif), $\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{if}\ t'\ \mathsf{then}\ t_1\ \mathsf{else}\ t_2 : (S_1' \curlyvee S_2') \curlyvee \ell'$. Then by Lemma 16 we know that $(S_1' \curlyvee S_2') <: S_z$, and by Lemma 18 if we choose $S' = (S_1' \curlyvee S_2') \curlyvee \ell'$, we conclude that $(S_1' \curlyvee S_2') \curlyvee \ell' <: S_z \curlyvee \ell$, i.e. $S' <: S$.

Case (λ_{SEC}-APP). Then $t = t_1\ t_2$ and $\Gamma \vdash^Z t_1\ t_2 : S_{12} \curlyvee \ell$ for some S_{12} and ℓ such that $\Gamma \vdash^Z t_1 : S_{11} \to_\ell S_{12}$ and $\Gamma \vdash^Z t_2 : S_{11}$.
Using induciton hypothesis on the premises we also know that $\Gamma \vdash t_1 : S_{11}' \to_{\ell'} S_{12}'$ for some S_{11}', S_{12}' and ℓ' such that $S_{11} <: S_{11}', S_{12}' <: S_{12}$ and $\ell' \preccurlyeq \ell$, and that $\Gamma \vdash t_2 : S_{12}''$ such that $S_{11}'' <: S_{11}$. By transitivity on subtyping then $S_{11}'' <: S_{11}'$. Then by (Sapp) $\Gamma \vdash t_1\ t_2 : S_{12}' \curlyvee \ell'$ and by Lemma 18 if we choose $S' = S_{12}' \curlyvee \ell'$, we conclude that $S_{12}' \curlyvee \ell' <: S_{12} \curlyvee \ell$, i.e. $S' <: S$.

□

Lemma 19. *Let S_1, S_2 and $S_3 \in$ TYPE.*

1. *If $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$ is defined, $S_1 <: S_3$ and $S_1 <: S_3$ then $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2) <: S_3$.*
2. *If $(S_1 \ddot{\wedge} S_2)$ is defined, $S_3 <: S_1$ and $S_3 <: S_2$ then $S_3 <: (S_1 \ddot{\wedge} S_2)$.*

Proof. We start by proving (1) by case analysis on type $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$.

Case (Bool_ℓ). As $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$ is defined then $S_1 = \mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_1}$ and $S_2 = \mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_2}$ for some ℓ_1 and ℓ_2. Also as $S_1 <: S_3$, then $S_3 = \mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_3}$ for some ℓ_3. By ($<:_{\mathsf{Bool}}$), $\ell_1 \preccurlyeq \ell_3$ and $\ell_2 \preccurlyeq \ell_3$ then by definition of $\curlyvee$, $(\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2) \preccurlyeq \ell_3$. Then $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2) = \mathsf{Bool}_{(\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2)} <: \mathsf{Bool}_{\ell_3}$, i.e. $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2) <: S_3$.

Case ($S \to_\ell S$). As $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2)$ is defined then $S_1 = S_{11} \to_{\ell_1} S_{12}$ and $S_2 = S_{21} \to_{\ell_1} S_{22}$ for some $S_{11}, S_{12}, S_{21}, S_{22}, \ell_1$ and ℓ_2. Also as $S_1 <: S_3$, then $S_3 = S_{31} \to_{\ell_3} S_{32}$ for some S_{31}, S_{32} and ℓ_3. By ($<:_\to$), $S_{31} <: S_{11}, S_{12} <: S_{32}, S_{31} <: S_{21}, S_{22} <: S_{32}, \ell_1 \preccurlyeq \ell_3$ and $\ell_2 \preccurlyeq \ell_3$.
Then $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2) = (S_{11} \ddot{\wedge} S_{21}) \to_{(\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2)} (S_{12} \ddot{\wedge} S_{22})$. By using induction hypothesis (2) then $S_{31} <: (S_{11} \ddot{\wedge} S_{21})$ and by using induction hypothesis (1) then $(S_{12} \ddot{\wedge} S_{22}) <: S_{32}$. Also by definition of $\curlyvee$, $(\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2) \preccurlyeq \ell_3$. Finally by ($<:_\to$) we conclude that $(S_{11} \ddot{\wedge} S_{21}) \to_{(\ell_1 \curlyvee \ell_2)} (S_{12} \ddot{\wedge} S_{22}) <: S_{31} \to_{\ell_3} S_{32}$, i.e. $(S_1 \ddot{\vee} S_2) <: S_3$.

The proof of (2) is similar to (1) but using the argument that if $\ell_3 \preccurlyeq \ell_1$ and $\ell_3 \preccurlyeq \ell_2$ then $\ell_3 \preccurlyeq (\ell_1 \curlywedge \ell_2)$. □